



Historic Town of Hyde Park

Planning Board

4383 Albany Post Road

Hyde Park, NY 12538

(845) 229-5111, Ext. 2, (845) 229-0349 Fax

“Working with you for a better Hyde Park”

**MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 3, 2021, 6:00 PM
PUBLIC HEARING/WORKSHOP/REGULAR MEETING OF
THE HYDE PARK PLANNING BOARD**

MEMBERS PRESENT VIA LIVE STREAMED MEETING:

**MICHAEL DUPREE, CHAIRMAN
ANNE DEXTER - VICE CHAIR
DIANE DI NAPOLI
BRENT PICKETT
STEPHANIE WASSER
ANN WEISER**

MEMBERS ABSENT: CHRISTOPHER OLIVER

**OTHERS PRESENT: VICTORIA POLIDORO, PB CONSULTING ATTORNEY
BONNIE FRANSON, PB CONSULTING PLANNER
LIZ AXELSON, CONSULTING PLANNER
PETER SETARO, PB CONSULTING ENGINEER
KATHLEEN MOSS, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CYNTHIA WITMAN, PB SECRETARY
COUNCILMAN KRUPNICK, TOWN WEBMASTER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
HUDSON VALLEY HOSPICE HOUSE	2-19
DUTCHESS COUNTY SPCA ADDITION	19-33

Chairman Dupree: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the February 3rd meeting of the Hyde Park Planning Board. I will note first that this meeting is being held under the auspices of Executive Order 202.92, the last extension of the original 202.1 by Governor Andrew Cuomo, which suspends the Open Meetings Law so that public officers can meet virtually as long as we allow the public to attend. Let me first confirm that each Board Member is alone or at least not under pressure to vote any certain way.

Ms. Weiser: I am alone

Ms. Wasser: I am alone

Mr. Pickett: I am alone.

Mr. Oliver: Absent

Ms. DiNapoli: I'm alone

Vice-Chair Dexter: I'm alone

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Please join me as we pledge our fealty to the American Flag.

The Chairman led the Pledge.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

HUDSON VALLEY HOSPICE HOUSE

Site Plan & Special Use Permit Approvals and 2 Lot Consolidation (#2020-17)

Location: 31 E. Dorsey Ln. & 542 Violet Ave.

Grid #s: 6163-02-570735, -552748

In Attendance via Zoom:

Michele Zerfas, Berger Engineering

Michael Kaminski, Hudson Valley Hospice

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is a continued public hearing for Hudson Valley Hospice House. The applicants are seeking Site Plan and Special Use Permit approvals as well as a two-lot consolidation in order to build a new structure for patients at Hospice House. May I get a motion to reopen the public hearing?

MOTION: Mr. Pickett

SECOND: Ms. DiNapoli

To re-open the Public Hearing for Hudson Valley Hospice House.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE **Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0** **Motion Carried**

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Any nays or abstentions? The motion carries. We had a new submission or revised submission as well as new comments and responses, et cetera. So, let's see, Michele.

Ms. Zerfas: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: There you are. Sorry. It's sometimes hard hunting through these squares. Let me turn it over to you.

Ms. Zerfas: Okay. Since you've last seen the Hudson Valley Hospice House, the overall site plan, which would be slide two. Okay, slide one, this is what the Hospice House front looks like, and then the second slide will be the site plan. The site plan is basically the same, except that we've added an oxygen tank in the back by the basement door. We've moved the generator and propane tank around to the back and we also moved the refuse enclosure to the back. You can now see that the bio retentions have changed in shape because they've now been designed for the proper water quality and we've added detention basin. And then we've also improved some grading, which is a complicated plan. So I'm not showing that one. And the detailed grading was another reason why we had to move the refuse enclosure farther back. Since the last time we've done a full storm water design. Again, there's the bio retentions and I've added into the bio retention areas, shag bark hickories. There's a detention basin. And the detention basin outlet is actually a series of chambers with weep holes. So water will spill into these chambers and then as they fill up, it'll go through small weep holes and this will provide slow down and reduce the velocity. Then they'll go to a stone, sand berm level spreader. And for this, the water just sort of flows through the sand and stone and overtop. The smaller storms will trickle through and the bigger storms will go over the top. The pipe is now fully designed. It will carry water around the development. This is the water that's coming from the off-site southeast and a low area. So that water will be taken care of. The water from the southeast, which flows onto the property will be directed to the detention basin for control before leaving the site. We will be performing more deep tests. And if we do find shallow groundwater, the DEC has a contingency where you just line up the bio retentions. We don't have a plaza at the road because we don't feel that this is needed, this extra impervious area. There's really nobody that ever uses the road. I don't even know there's a bus stop farther at the intersection. You know, this area has never become the Hamlet it wanted to be, so it just seems like an impervious area that's not needed. The same way with the sidewalk from Violet Avenue to the building also seems like additional impervious that's not needed. Most people in shopping centers or rural neighborhoods seem to be able to walk along the roads just fine. For the few people that might want to walk between Violet Avenue and the building would be able to just walk

down this low use driveway. The other thing too is this is a site that doesn't really want strangers just wandering in. They want to have their peace and quiet and not really have gawkers come through. The landscaping is similar to what it was before. A few trees have been moved around because of grading. There are fences along to block the headlights. This will also block some of the noise. Although there won't be much noise on the site. Just some typical quiet sounds, but the fences will help. There's Maples and hickories in addition to the previous landscaping and have been added to the bio retention. Other trees and plants are proposed on the lot, bio retention plan, which would be, I mean, on the landscape plan, which would be slide four. And then the area of trees to the south. That area's sparsely treed. If those of you who remember who went on the site walk, there are trees out there, but they're spread out with lots of the Rose Cane underneath. So this area is not really going to be put into preservation because it's going to need maintenance. Those Rose Canes are invasive species. There are trees proposed along the road. The one section by the bio retention, where there no trees are proposed is because the bio retention will be five feet high and it's going to provide its own screening. So that covers the majority of the items. I would be very interested in hearing the Planning Board's comments and opinions on this project. So Chairman Dupree, I'll send it back to you.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Board Members, do you want to go first for one since, instead of having the consultants speak? So Board Members do you want to go first? Let's break with tradition tonight. How about starting with Diane? Ms. DiNapoli?

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay. Good evening, everyone. I did hear, Michele, you talking about not having a need to have benches and any landscape at the opening?

Ms. Zerfas: There is landscape. We're proposing trees up there. we just didn't know if there'd be a purpose to have benches up there since it's isolated.

Ms. DiNapoli: Well I do think benches are important. Unless you're only going to hire staff, that guarantee only drive with cars. You have employees that will be taking buses, public transportation, and that would be a courtesy. Not only for them to have it, but I could also see, if not the residents there themselves, family members there who have been there with their loved ones wanting to go for a walk. And before they turned around and walked back down, I could see them wanting to sit, especially if it's nicely landscaped. So I do think a bench or two would be important in the area. I'm also still very concerned about the two-way traffic going around the building. I read very clearly your comments, but if it's a 20-foot-wide driveway, why couldn't everyone just go in one direction? Why does it have to be two way?

Ms. Zerfas: Two-way allows for the different services to be able to use it? Most of the people that come to visit are just going to go into the parking lot and back out. The back driveway is primarily going to be for the different services that need to use it. It's a 22-foot-wide road, which means 11-foot lanes. Your standard highway is 11-foot lane. So it's really not as narrow as it appears or as you think it is.

Ms. DiNapoli: So if you made it 20 feet. That's more than sufficient just to keep it as a one-way road.

Ms. Zerfas: Well, it's two ways. Different trucks have to come in different directions depending on what they're doing.

Mr. Setaro: Why would that be Michele, just out of curiosity?

Ms. Zerfas: It depends on where they want to stop because it's fairly steep going down to the back and then it flattens out. So if they want to be able to stop, let's say they're there at the back end of the oxygen tank, they would have to go counter-clockwise. If they want to stop so that they're at the basement door, they would have to go clockwise. If they want the back end of their vehicles to be in those locations. This is not high traffic and it is 22 wide. So it's two 11-foot lanes.

Mr. Setaro: Well, that's why, I mean, if it's not a high traffic area, then that kind of makes more of an argument for having it a one-way system. And I think and I'm sorry, Diane, I didn't mean to jump in, but just while I was thinking about it, most of the tanks that are going to be serviced are right in the same area. I believe, Right?

Ms. Zerfas: Yeah. But I don't know which end of the truck is going to have to be at and which end of the truck has to be there.

Ms. DiNapoli: Did you design it so that everything goes in the flow of a one-way direction, but won't the garbage truck have to go counter-clockwise?

Ms. Zerfas: Yeah, well actually I've turned that around so now the garbage truck is going clockwise.

Ms. DiNapoli: But couldn't the other reasons for needing to have truck deliveries in that area all be in the same area so it's just in one direction.

Ms. Zerfas: I can make it one way. I just don't know if, when they actually start using this and I'm really not worried because it's such low traffic and 22 foot wide is actually a reasonable width. Two trucks could be on it.

Ms. DiNapoli: Well then why not make it all one direction and make it smaller, make it 20 feet. So you save two feet of impervious area.

Ms. Zerfas: There are the firetruck codes.

Ms. DiNapoli: I thought it was 20 feet, you had to be.

Ms. Zerfas: No, I'd have to re-look at it. I can make it one way.

Chairman Dupree: According to your response letter of November 30th, 2020, in that, PA-1, your national fire code, the road drive with must be 20 feet minimum.

Ms. Zerfas: Yeah. It's a minimum. And you're in the back there where there's a propane tank and an oxygen tank and access to the building. But I can make it one way. That's not a problem.

Ms. DiNapoli: I may be the only one. So why don't you wait and hear what my other Board Members think and that was one of my biggest concerns and the other is having a bench at the front. In terms of having trees along 9G. Michael, that was a question you asked. I had mixed feelings about that. Basically, because it is such an attractive looking building, I think being able to see it as you're whizzing by is an asset. Unless of course the trees are there for the privacy of the people who are there. If that's the purpose of it, then I have absolutely no issue with it.

Ms. Axelson: Can I just insert one thing while Board Members are going around? There were the two points, one Diane that you already brought up about having a few benches, a little something, but also for people to be able to walk from the front, back to the building without walking in the driveway. So that was the other comment. And again, looking to hear what Planning Board members have to say.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. And remember Diane that trees planted along 9G can always be limbed up so that you can have a view of the attractive building and also provide some shade for people who walk along the sidewalk. Let me call up Ms. Wasser, how about you next?

Ms. Wasser: Thank you. I feel strongly about the sidewalk along that edge. I just don't like people having to walk down a driveway. I don't think that's really very good planning. I doubt this is going to attract gawkers and strangers. So I feel strongly about adding the sidewalk. The bench, it's just a bench. I mean, because I think there's still going to be people who are going to be picked up, dropped off, use public transportation and walk and I agree with that comment. I don't have the strong feelings about the two-way direction at all. I'm kind of fine with that as is. I appreciated Pete's detailed comments and I'm still a little concerned about protecting existing, adjacent wells and foundations. I'm glad that Pete added that he wants distances to the individual wells and in some kind of measuring, beforehand. So, just to protect the neighbors interests on that. I guess we could use a few more trees along 9G, especially to screen a little bit of the parking on the northern edge. And actually I also want to comment on those long vinyl fences that are on the south-southeast, well there was a long one and a short one. There are only two trees in that section that doesn't have fence, that is behind a home and I think something else should be put there. Do people know what I'm talking about?

Ms. Zerfas: Okay. Yeah. That's in front of the automotive place. It's kind of (inaudible) no area, but we can add more trees.

Ms. Wasser: Well, I don't know, I'll wait and hear what some of my colleagues have to say. And I also agree with Pete's comments on clarifying all of the perimeter trees, which to remain and showing that more carefully about what you're taking out and what you're leaving. I think those are my comments. That's it.

Chairman Dupree: Ms. Wasser, thank you. Vice-Chair Dexter, do you want to weigh in?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Yes. Interesting discussion. Interesting about the one way versus two way, and I'm not sure I care too much about one way versus two way, but I think you can get away with the minimum standard and if it is 20 feet, to me that would be preferable than putting in extra when you may not need it. I would imagine it's going to be very rare

when you're going to have deliveries all hitting at the same time. I remember...Michael, remember when we had Dunkin Donuts and we were worried about how they were going to deliver things and they were like, that truck goes south on 9G at 7:30 on Tuesday mornings, comes up Route 9 northbound. That was like, Oh, okay. So most of these places will know and can schedule their deliveries. You can't say now how frequently the oxygen delivery is going to be, but you do know that you can probably work with them. And I do buy that. I think that's fine. I'd rather see it less pervious, so if you can get away with the 20 feet and if that is the standard, I'd prefer to have that. And I thought I cared about the benches at the end of the driveway and then I started to think, it is 200 feet away, if you could anchor them in somehow, I think that would be great. The problem is the benches would walk if they're not like, permanent. We tried to install some, just a nice little bench, somewhere for people who were waiting for buses and it was stolen within two weeks. So if you could do that, I do believe that people who are waiting for the bus, because I do believe that you will have employees who will use public transportation. I would like to see that. And the other part was about the walkway from building to 9G. Interestingly, when my dad was at a local nursing home, we did most of our walking in the walkway. There were some sidewalks, but it turned out that the road was actually better maintained and had less dips and bumps and things to trip over, so we did most of our walking there and there really isn't the traffic. If a car does come in there's plenty of room to pull over. And again I'm not really interested in seeing any more impervious on the site. So I don't really think a walkway is needed at this point. I think that was it.

Chairman Dupree: Thanks Anne. Nice as always. Let's see. Ann Weiser, there you are.

Ms. Weiser: Hi, so I'm in agreement about the benches because I do believe that employees and there may be family members taking public transit as well. So I think a place for them to wait for a bus, and you can always flag a bus, you don't need to have a formal bus stop to catch a bus. You can be waiting, sitting on a bench and flag the bus, so because of that, I think that a place for them to wait would be good. Plus I do think the sidewalk from 9G is important. I think it's uncivilized to ask people to walk on the road. I really think that we should provide them with a sidewalk that feels safe. I don't have an opinion on the two way or the one way, so I'm directional neutral on that one. That's it.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. And Mr. Pickett?

Mr. Pickett: Thank you. I prefer the sidewalk. It would need to be maintained over time, but walking from the site up to 9G, I'd prefer to see it. The trees that you have along 9G, instead of being a straight line, I'd like to see them with staggered depths from the edge of the road. So it would look more natural. You have a very nice, good looking site and I think staggering the depth of the trees through there would keep it looking natural. I've got no preference on the one way or two ways, but if you wanted to go to 20 feet, you could always bump it up to 22, right near the tanks that you would service. Those are my inputs.

Chairman Dupree: Wow, Board Members, you were succinct tonight and on.

Ms. DiNapoli: Michael, I don't remember if I weighed in about the sidewalk.

Chairman Dupree: You did. "Need benches and sidewalk from the street for staff and employees. Concerned about two-way direction for the roadway in the rear".

Ms. DiNapoli: Then I misspoke, because I shouldn't have clumped the sidewalks in with the benches, my mistake. I don't think sidewalks already essential.

Ms. DiNapoli: Sorry about that.

Chairman Dupree: Let's go to the consultants, Ms. Axelson?

Ms. Axelson: I was most interested to hear what the Planning Board really felt about those things in the front. If it's okay. I might skip around a bit because the next big set of comments are from Pete about the rock and all that. This submittal was very substantial. A lot of information was provided. It would help to have some more clarity on the limits of disturbance and to have that line shown on more of the plan sheets, because it relates to grading landscaping, et cetera. Then I think the Board already touched on the notation about existing wooded areas in that, language that we put in the comments was crafted in part with Michael and Tad, I believe and whoever else was at the agenda meeting. There's a history of the Board asking for existing wooded areas to be left in a natural state, so I tried to write that as we saw fit. Let's see, we had some concerns about clarity on ramps, especially with the ambulance access to the building to see if more of that curb could be dropped. And then I had suggested several more trees along the northern site boundary to buffer the two northern parking areas that are there. And another comment that I have, and I don't know if the Board wants to weigh in on this, the fence which is proposed generously, the privacy fence on the north and along the south, it's proposed as white, which I felt would stand out. And so I'm suggesting in my comments, a grayish color or a gray brown. The lighting plan looked pretty good. We just need some details there. And then Pete and I both wondered how employees would get to the refuse enclosure. If there could be some kind of pathway for them to be safe with trucks going on behind the building.

Mr. Setaro: Well, can I follow up on that Liz just a second while we're on refuse enclosure? It also seemed like the refuse enclosure was very far away from the building. And I was just wondering if that can be relocated somewhere else that may be more convenient for the employees. It just seemed like it was a long walk and again how they were going to get there safely. All right, Liz, sorry.

Ms. Axelson: No, that's fine and some of our comments kind of dovetail and overlap. I believe there's a possibility of phasing on this site, so it would be helpful to see the phasing plan. And correct me if I'm wrong, Pete, but I think phasing is also kind of a mitigation for erosion and sedimentation control. A lot of the comments had to do with a little bit more clarity about limit of disturbance lines and retaining wooded area lines. And then I thought a few more trees at the south end of the building would be a good idea, because there's kind of a thin line of retained vegetation and it sounds like it's kind of scrappy, maybe deciduous, maybe some Cedars, so maybe a couple more trees down there. Those are my big issues and the Board has already commented on the pedestrian facilities.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you Liz. Mr. Setaro?

Mr. Setaro: Before I get into a couple of the engineering things, one other thing that I noticed was that on the southern property line that there's a privacy fence proposed and based upon a site walk that we had out there to look at the drainage most of the houses

along Dorsey Lane much higher than the property line. So in my opinion, I don't think a six-foot fence will do anything. Plus they would have to take down some trees to put it in, so in my opinion, it would be best to basically leave that area in its natural state and possibly if there's a visual issue from the neighbors, towards the building, maybe put in a couple more evergreens around the access road. That's something that the Board can go look at. It's really not under my purview, but I just wanted to mention, I don't think that fence is going to do much do much good and there's no sense in spending the money and also taking down the trees there to put it in. So that's something that can be discussed. As far as some of the comments, I did mention about rock. As we all know, we discussed rock a lot during of the SEQRA process. So now that the plans are more detailed, as Michelle stated, there's a fairly significant drainage line going around the front of the property along the northern property and ending up in the back. That drainage line is in some cases nine to 10 foot deep, so I would assume that that's going to be into some rock. It's hard to tell, but we know there's a lot of rock on the site. And Michele had mentioned that they were going to do some additional soil tests for the storm water facility. So I recommend that there be some more deep tests done also in areas where we're going to have some deep excavations, such as that drainage line that I mentioned. There's also the force main for the sewage pump station, which will be about four and a half feet below grade and then maybe a couple more deep tests, while they're going to have an excavator out there, a couple more deep tests in the building area to try and further define the rock because we are concerned. Especially because we had a couple of wells that were on the adjoining properties to the north that were actually, I think one was within a couple hundred feet of the building and now that we know that there's going to be a drainage line there that's fairly deep, that's just something we're going to have to watch. And I think honestly that the owner of the property will also want to know how much he's getting into, because it's going to be a major cost implication. So the deep tests are not only for our use in mitigating any impacts, but it's for cost impact for the owner.

Ms. Polidoro: Pete are recommending these deep tests, what's the timing of these tests? Is it now, before approval is granted? Is it after, but before building permits?

Mr. Setaro: Oh no, no, no, no, no. Now! I mean, that's something that Michele would have to do also, when she had mentioned about additional deep tests for the stormwater. Those have to be done as part of the approval process. All right? So to that end and also about rock, we had talked during a prior review when we were going through SEQRA, we talked about crushing. So, assuming that that's still on the table, there should be an area shown on the map of where the rock stockpiles would be and where the crushing operation would take place. And we'd have to look at the hours of operation. Similar to what we did on the Bellefield site. That's something we're going to need. Let me go to a couple of things, we hit rock crushing, refuse enclosure, Michele, where do you stand in terms of when you think you're going to make an application to the Department of Health?

Ms. Zerfas: We submitted an initial one last spring or last summer and we're going to be doing a follow-up one this week or next week.

Mr. Setaro: Okay, because one thing I mentioned there was the well that you're going to have to put in, you're going to have to go and drill the well and it's going to be classified as a public water supply. So I assume they're going make you do some kind of a draw down test and obviously test it for water quality.

Ms. Zerfas: Yes. We'll have to do the complete part five testing and 24 hour draw down.

Mr. Setaro: All right. So, depending on the pump test requirements and how much it's going to be pumped at, we may need to talk to the Health Department about some of the wells that are closer, on the northern property line, in terms of the potential for maybe asking the property owners whether you have other right to monitor their wells during the draw down. So once you get into the Health Department, maybe that's something that we can work together on with Jason Teed. What the pump test requirements are going to be. Let me see here, we talked about the privacy fence, talked about the refuse enclosures. I think those were my major engineering comments. The other thing I did mention was, Michele, I wasn't sure in the ambulance drop-off area, it seemed like there was only one small ramp that they could use. And I don't know the grades in that area, but I was just curious to whether that whole area could be a depressed curb and have a reasonable slope from the drop-off area to the building.

Ms. Zerfas: I'll check with the architect who's the expert in this, in Hospice.

Mr. Setaro: Okay. Well, they're going to go pull up and then the ramp is at the opposite end? Well, again, depending on how we're going to do the traffic flow, then the ramp is at one end of the drop-off area. So again, it's something you can just go look at, it might be something that you may want to consider.

Ms. Zerfas: Yeah. So I'll address it with the architect.

Mr. Setaro: And I just had a question. I wasn't sure what an evaporator was.

Ms. Zerfas: It's part of the oxygen system.

Mr. Setaro: Oxygen. Okay. I think that was it for the highlights.

Ms. Axelson: And Pete and the Board knows they're very detailed notes about construction, demolition, excavation, and hours, and referencing the Code and detailed rock excavation notes.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you, Ms. Moss comments? None?

Ms. Moss: No, no comments. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Ms. Polidoro?

Ms. Polidoro: I just want to let the Board know that the Zoning Board has not voted on the variance request yet. And so the public hearing should be continued at least for one more meeting until we know how the Zoning Board will decide.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. I was just going to say that they'd closed the public hearing, but just as we do, they left it open with the proviso that written comments be accepted for 10 days. And this would be the seventh day, I believe, so there's still an opportunity for people to submit comments on the area variance that's there. So, thanks

colleagues. Before I add in my comments, I think we should hear from the public. Let me start with, oh Mr. Pickett?

Mr. Pickett: Also, the fencing that you're talking about, it's a polymer fence, is it for security or for visual blocking?

Ms. Zerfas: It's for the benefit of the neighbors to block headlights and some noise.

Mr. Pickett: Okay. All right. Because those polymer fences sometimes can get...

Ms. Zerfas: One of the comments for the Zoning Board from one of the neighbors was if the building goes in, I'll have to install a fence.

Mr. Pickett: Okay. Because sometimes with those fences, I've got them and you need to high pressure spray them or bleach them. Yeah, if you're blocking headlights, you need that otherwise, I thought maybe a green light chain link fence, four-foot, six foot, since you're out, kind of in a forest area, might look better, but if they're blocking headlights, that doesn't do it. Thank you.

Ms. Weiser: Yeah. And I agreed with Liz on the gray brown color, when you were talking about color for fence, because it really blends into trees better.

Ms. DiNapoli:

Yeah, I agree.

Mr. Setaro: Michael, if I could just add one thing before we open to the public. I forgot, on the discussion in regards to a one way or two way. I think we're going to reduce it to 20 feet, being that it's not going to be a high traffic area. I don't know that it's a big issue, that if it's reduced to 20 feet, that if you keep it at two way and stripe it, I don't think 10-foot lanes are really an issue. In fact, if that we're doing a fairly large site, subdivision development project in another municipality and the Highway Superintendent there is actually requested 20-foot-wide roads and it's a fairly large project. So, I don't know Michele, it's something for you to think about. I don't know if anybody else has any thoughts on that, but I don't personally think it's an issue if you reduce it to 20 and keep it two way because I don't think there's going to be a lot of traffic back there, as you said.

Ms. Zerfas: There's not. There's a couple of steep slopes going down around the building. But there wasn't a lot of traffic. It'll be a couple of times a day maybe.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah, okay. So I just want to add that before we turn it over to the public. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Let me go in the order people signed up. Ms. Hudak, you're first.

Ms. Hudak: Hi. Thank you. Michele, could I see the map again, of the site plan? Would you mind bringing that up, if you could? I just wanted to see where the dumpsters and things like that would be.

Ms. Zerfas: Neil that's number two, it will be the second slide. Okay. The dumpsters are in the back between the, it's kind of a shaded area, which is where the oxygen tank is. You know, where the car repair place is. This is just north of the car repair place. Kind of the northwest corner of the car repair place. There's a little bump out, a little rectangle that's coming down off the driveway next to the bio retention. That's where the dumpster's located.

Ms. Wasser: I think it'd be helpful if you could use a point on the plan, just to make sure everyone's clear. I don't know if it's Neil's screen or your screen.

Ms. Zerfas: It's Neil's, there it is, he's got it. Thank you, Neil.

Ms. Wasser: Great. Thank you.

Ms. Hudak: And then, the septic system and the well that we're talking about.

Ms. Zerfas: Okay. The well is in the courtyard, in the middle, right next to the building, the back of the building in the courtyard, yes, right there. That's the well. And the septic system, on the left side, you'll see two kind of rectangles together, the big open area, that's where the absorption fields will be.

Ms. Wasser: Up against 9G?

Ms. Zerfas: Yes.

Ms. Hudak: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. Okay. And I would just like to reiterate and stress, the evergreen plantings and the trees, just for the privacy, because we can see right through to 9G when the leaves are off the trees. And the noise, that would help with the noise. So those are my main concerns, the privacy for the neighbors and our well, of course. So thank you.

Chairman Dupree: And I caught the whole concept about the evergreens, both for views, privacy and for noise attenuation. So thank you. And next up was Ms. DiGilio. Susan?

Ms. DiGilio: Hi. I just want to thank the Board for such a wonderful job of taking everything into consideration, all of our concerns. The only thing I have to say is a dark fence with some Cedar trees would be lovely. Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: I agree with you that we're going to need to...I didn't know this, but at our agenda meeting, I Googled while we were at our Zoom and looked at all the colors for vinyl fences. I just assumed they were white and gray. That's all I've ever seen. They come in every color, including hot pink of all things. I don't know why you'd want a hot pink fence, I guess maybe Baskin Robbins if they still have those. But at any rate, I was going to echo my colleagues that a natural earth tone color, such as gray brown would blend in better than what the white would and there's no difference in the cost whatsoever for the different colors. So, thank you. Mr. Leonard?

Mr. Leonard: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for taking the time and considering all of us as a neighborhood. We do appreciate that. As far as the looking and viewing from the

neighborhood that we have, six foot wouldn't be high enough because I look into Sue's second story. So six feet, isn't going to be enough. And as a discussion that you're having, thank you for viewing it as what we see and that's important. So if it was fencing and trees, I think the noise and visual and blocking would be sufficient if we consider that something for everyone. In addition, thank you, Pete, for coming out, I do appreciate that. And taking your time to consider the neighborhood for the water problems, the wells and everything involved. Sufficient drainage is necessary because it affects all of us. Is there something that's going to be put in place for, an oil separator for the parking lot? That's something that would be considered. And I don't know if anybody really looked into that because it is going to be blacktopped. And if you have a spill or something it's going to go into drainage. So that might be something to consider. I'm not sure if it's necessary or something like that.

Chairman Dupree: As far as I know, Mr. Leonard, the DEC requires a distance for separation of oil for things, ironically for fueling stations, although they don't for, say, Dunkin Donuts, or McDonald's or any of the fast-food restaurants, where you have cars idling, which to me seems like a bigger problem myself. At any rate, Pete can probably comment on that better than I can.

Mr. Leonard: We agree. And it's just a question. And I don't know all the rules, so that's why I asked the question. And sometimes people don't ask it because they're unaware of what could be out there to prevent these problems. The drainage water, it's going into the environment. And it's just one of those things that we like to protect the environment. So with that, I still say thank you to everyone and keep up the good work for protecting everything. Higher fence. More trees for the neighborhood. The well, inspection prior, definitely. Afterwards, definitely. A depth for doing the inspections to the wells, as Pete had mentioned, my well is 25 feet, so to do a deep well test, isn't something for me. Mine's affected at 25 feet. Whereas Sue's is affected at 25 feet also. So this area is in a range of 25 feet to the next house over is at 400. So that's the difference that we have that can affect everyone differently. So the testing has to be posed for that. Does that make sense? Okay, well perfect. Thank you very much for, for taking the time for us and hearing us. It does mean a lot.

Chairman Dupree: As always, let me thank the three of you for coming out, because again, our reviews are shaped for the better when we hear from neighbors and residents. Because unless one of us happens to live nearby, we're not going to know all the things that you do and you gave us a great amount of knowledge last time. I also thanked Peter when he came out and told us what the results were, et cetera. Peter, I don't believe that an oil separator is needed in something like this, is it?

Mr. Setaro: No, it's not considered a hotspot area. I mean, typically the bio retention areas and all that provide the treatment that the DEC requires for a standard parking lot.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. So let me go back up and summarize some stuff. I'm going to weigh in and say that I also think that the sidewalk is necessary. 108-4.5 C (3)(a) basically says pedestrian access should be provided from the street to all uses on a site. In this case, this is a brand-new site, so I don't see a reason why not to. I agree that there may be in the future, more people needing to come to this site, who use public transportation and we need to make sure they have safe access to the interior. I agree that there are still

concerns for blasting and the drilling of rock and Pete's talked about how to do that. I agree with Pete, that since some of the storm drain lines that run north from the property lines are 9 and 10 feet deep, more deep testing should be done. I want to encourage you to start the discussion also with Department of Transportation, if you haven't already done so Michele. Just because they've been a little odd to deal with lately, I'll put it that way. I'm going to agree in the color of the vinyl fencing, brown, dark gray, something that would make it look more earth tone. I also share Pete's concern about the refuse enclosure. I didn't see a sidewalk to it. I assume it's going to all be on one pad, that's it. But I also, Michele, maybe you can, or Mr. Kaminsky, one of the two of you can clarify, the people going to the dumpster or refuse enclosure, are they going to be going out of the basement and then just walking down the road? Is that it? Or has that been planned out?

Ms. Zerfas: That'll probably be the primary, in the other location they would have had to have gone out of the upper, the main building.

Chairman Dupree: That's what I thought. This looks like it's not that bad to me, except for maybe winter. When we have snows like, we've just had about trying to get trash out.

Mr. Kaminski: I was just going to add that not every staff member is going to be needing to access the dumpster area. It's really just housekeeping, who generally are there in the evening and nights.

Chairman Dupree: Also, the ramp for the ambulance access doesn't look that big, but then again, I will trust Mr. Machado because that's what he does in terms of being an architect, is design specifically places like this. But Michele, I noticed you said that you would check as well. And then, Pete touched on the fact that since this is a public water supply that there'll need to be additional testing and monitoring perhaps of adjacent properties to see if the wells are impacted. I know that Ms. Zerfas has already given us information that because this is so much lower, it's going to be a deep well, that it's unlikely that it will impact the wells, but we need to make sure as the neighbors have said that that actually needs to be true. I will also agree by the way, with Ms. Dexter that benches would be great, but I also think that they need to be anchored. You can take a look at the ones that are along 9 right now. I love when Anne said they walk away and I'm like, not by themselves. I see this a lot. I also don't have a preference for one way versus two way. I think it'd be great if we're going to be talking about adding a plaza and the sidewalk from the entry into the building, that you would reduce the impervious in the back. I also agree with Ms. Axelson that more trees along the south side of the building would be desirable because there's not that much left there. And also even though, Ms. Moss did not speak and I'll let her speak after me if she disagrees, but when we leave notes that talk about existing trees to remain, that doesn't mean that you can't go through and selectively take out invasives like Ailanthus or the tree of heaven, tree of life. Get rid of the Rosa Rugosa canes, there's lots of stuff that I could see in there, Michele, that's invasive and a thicket sort of still helps screen and do noise attenuation, but at the same time, you don't want it to look junky either or be unsafe. The question I had was when you added the one about trees that are leaning, I'm not sure that that's...Just everyone knows there's no such thing as an arborist with a license in this state. Anybody who wants to be an arborist can say, I'm an arborist, there's no test, there's no license, no permit, nothing. You would hope that they're educated, but a lot of times you'll have people saying that that tree looks dangerous because it's arching, there's no danger to it. Trees don't have taproots. They all

pretty much grow their roots out unless they're anchored into rock, where they fall into a crevice. That doesn't mean they can't blow over, but it's usually unlikely. Tad do you want to weigh in on that about the natural state?

Ms. Moss: I think that the one I'm thinking of is the old Stop and Shop that was maintained quote unquote, in a natural state. And there were vines growing all over the trees and there were invasives and you couldn't see through to the parking area or the building. And the site plan had a note that it was to be maintained in a park-like state. And when the property changed hands, they did maintain it in a park-like state and it's beautiful. So I want the applicant and the Board to think about how they want that to look. Do they want grass beneath the older trees? Do they want thickets of vegetation to provide more screening? Just to realize that the language of the note makes a difference.

Chairman Dupree: And the reason why I asked Tad to weigh in is when you leave it in a completely natural state, it does mean that the crowding can actually reduce the health of the good trees you want. For everybody, when the prior owners of Stop and Shop were putting it on the market, they approached Tad and I about actually going on site with them and us taping trees that we thought should be retained. If you can remember before it got limbed up and cleaned up, you couldn't even see the Stop and Shop. It was like a sleeping beauty's thicket back there. You had to chop your way through to find anything. When Tad and I took our site walk, we had like four things of tape thinking, we're going to protect a lot of these trees. And when we actually looked more closely a lot of them had become diseased because, you know, that's why silviculture happens. That's why sometimes selective tree removal is healthier for the forest trees you have. So at any rate, I just want the Board to think about this because again, the thicket would provide more screening, at least during leaf on. But it also means that there's more maintenance for the applicant over time. And it wouldn't have that sort of park-like environment. And this is also for the applicants to think about too. Otherwise, that's all I have. I think that from our neighbors who spoke, it appears evergreen plantings are important, as well as the fence. Mr. Leonard, just for you, where the fence is located, it can't be higher than six feet without going for an area variance, which I doubt the applicants want to go to. It would have to be brought in within the front yard setback because there's a road access, you can access Dorsey. But even then, there's a limit to how tall they can go. I think evergreens are probably going to be more of what you want because they'll look more natural.

Mr. Leonard: Choice of tree could be something that you could use as well to cause it to be a fence. And that would be something that we could do. And that would definitely be appreciated. I did have another question. Under the testing, that's going to be done for the wells. Where would we go to get the information or is it possible for one of us to be designated to give it to our neighbors so that you could send it to us?

Mr. Setaro: Well, Brian, what do you mean by testing?

Mr. Leonard: When you do the testing and you wanted to find out if it was going to impact us, is that going to be information that shared?

Mr. Setaro: Okay, so what typically happens with that is that I, as the engineer for the Town or any engineer for the Town would work with the applicant and the County Health Department. If we, as the engineer for the Town, thought there was a concern about

potential draw down to neighbor's wells. We would work with the Health Department and the applicant, and then if it was deemed that maybe we should look at monitoring adjacent property owner', wells, then what would have to happen is that the applicant would send the property owner a letter. And I have done this on some of our private development jobs in the past, so what you do is you send the property owner a letter and say we're going to do some pump tests. We would like to monitor your well for draw down. And there's certain things that you're not supposed to use the well, while the pump test is going on, yada, yada. So any property owner would have to sign an agreement. And it's not an invasive thing. The problem is, I don't know if any of those wells out there have well caps or if they're buried wells. If they're buried wells, that's kind of an issue.

Mr. Leonard: Mine is buried.

Mr. Setaro: All right. Well, that's just something that we'll have to deal with, but, you know, the bottom line is, if there was some monitoring that was deemed necessary, the property owner would get a letter well in advance that they would have to agree to the monitoring and sign off on it and send it back. So that's typically what happens.

Mr. Leonard: Is there going to be notice sent when you do the test? So if we notice, let's just give it a hypothetical of the next day or three days later, we noticed that our water changed or the smell changed or something like that. So we know that it's not something that is happening to just us. It's something that happened while you did that.

Mr. Setaro: I think what you're referring to is, is if the Health Department and others said, we don't think that you need to monitor any wells. You're asking, I think, if the neighbors can be notified, regardless, of when the pump test is going to be done. Is that right?

Mr. Leonard: Yes. Yes.

Mr. Setaro: So that's a Planning Board decision. If the Planning Board says, we don't have a problem notifying, we can certainly go find that out and we can send out letters. I mean, that's really a Planning Board decision.

Ms. Polidoro: Pete, just to be clear though, no one has made the decision that there needs to be monitoring.

Mr. Setaro: No.

Mr. Leonard: We understand that.

Mr. Setaro: No, but they're talking about, what Brian's talking about is if there wasn't going to be any formal monitoring of their wells by putting a prisometer inside the well and recording the levels and all that kind of stuff. If that wasn't deemed necessary, what Brian is asking is can somebody let us know in advance of when the applicant is going to do the pump test on their onsite well?

Mr. Leonard: Yes.

Chairman Dupree: And Ms. Zerfas I hope will yes and then she can just send that to Cynthia and I, and then we can send that out to you guys. Because we have your emails because you've been using your emails to register, to come and speak here. We can also send out a letter, if you prefer snail mail.

Ms. Zerfas: Okay. Yes, I'll come up with something. Normally the monitoring is done on much higher, well yield tests.

Mr. Setaro: No, I agree. You know, we'll have to see.

Ms. Zerfas: I'll have to modify the standard letter and I'll send it through the Town, for the Town to send out to the neighbors, because this is the Town asking for this.

Mr. Leonard: Now, in addition, this is a question for you Pete, does 9G have a water source right there for the building?

Mr. Setaro: No.

Mr. Leonard: Or does it end at the intersection?

Mr. Setaro: Yes, it ends at the intersection.

Mr. Leonard: Would it be something that's possible to extend that from the intersection as a water source for that building?

Ms. Zerfas: Pete, I'll answer that. I've already had discussions with the Health Department on that. That water source is having some issues. So trying to extend it, in fact when they extended the water for the condos, apartments across the road there, they went a different direction because that water system is not capable.

Mr. Leonard: I didn't know where it went. That's why I asked that question.

Ms. Zerfas: Right, it's a good question, but to go to the intersection and it's not...

Mr. Leonard: It would've made things easy.

Ms. Zerfas: Well, we looked at that first because that would be our preference.

Mr. Leonard: Right and I figured that's why you were going in that direction for a well, because of that, but still have to pose the question. But thank you.

Chairman Dupree: They did check that out. That's actually the Town of Poughkeepsie water district. It's not Hyde Park. That's the other problem. They said no, that the applicants have no guarantee of being in it and that's why they asked, because if they're having problems right now, they're not going to extend it out to let anybody else in right now. But it is a good question.

Mr. Leonard: Well, thank you again for everything. We do appreciate it as a neighborhood.

Chairman Dupree: Thanks, Michele. Thanks everybody. I don't think there's anything left tonight.

Ms. Axelson: I just want to make a suggestion because Tad and I have done this in the past, but maybe to confer with Michele about what's out there as far as existing vegetation and try to tailor the recommended notation to better fit the site.

Chairman Dupree: Well, as long as we're at it, before we adjourn this, let me just go through a quick rundown. So you all know what the Sake' Brewery now looks like, the trees along Route 9 and along St. Andrews. Do you want something like that, or would you prefer to see it more thickety and wild and natural, untamed, so to speak? Ann, let me start with you, Ann Weiser.

Ms. Weiser: Well, I'm in favor of a park-like setting. I think for the site and for the purpose of the hospice, that kind of look is also very soothing. So park-like for me.

Chairman Dupree: I agree. Stephanie?

Ms. Wasser: I'm fine with that as well. I don't have strong feelings about it.

Mr. Pickett: I prefer a more natural setting with staggered trees, distanced from the street coming back.

Chairman Dupree: Ms. Dexter?

Vice-Chair Dexter: You're breaking up just a little bit, but that's okay. I think the site is big enough that you can do a blend of both. So I like the park-like immediately around the building and then the south easterly area, that can kind of remain as is, because that would probably block it better than anything else.

Chairman Dupree: You've just expressed exactly what I've been thinking. How to do sort of a combination of both. Ms. DiNapoli?

Ms. DiNapoli: Anne said what I was thinking. Great minds think alike.

Chairman Dupree: We have clearer direction now, because I keep thinking about the neighbors and privacy, and I think that going from park-like and then extending out to a more natural look, as you get around the borders would provide that for them. And we can supplement the external area with some evergreens that would provide privacy.

Ms. DiNapoli: And the rooms were in the back, correct? So I guess I was also thinking if it was more forest-like, in the back, that would also be interesting for people.

Ms. Axelson: So it sounds like a natural setting in the areas of existing retained vegetation.

Chairman Dupree: With the ability to remove invasives at any time. So there being no other discussion, I want to thank the applicant for continuing this project. And for, as Liz said earlier, submitting a much more detailed proposal. I know that that's what we were

kind of waiting on and I felt like we just made a great leap forward in receiving this and because the ZBA won't be acting until three weeks from today, I think we could go ahead and adjourn this to March 3rd and that way you should have the results of the ZBA and we can then move forward further. So may I get a motion to adjourn this to March 3rd?

MOTION: Diane DiNapoli

SECOND: Brent Pickett

To adjourn the Public Hearing for Hudson Valley Hospice House to March 3, 2021.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. All in favor please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Nays or abstentions? Only one absence. Thank you, Mr. Kaminsky. Thank you, Ms. Zerfas, good to see you. If you need anything in the interim, feel free to contact Pete, me, Cynthia, Tad, Liz, anybody. Okay.

WORKSHOP:

DUTCHESS COUNTY SPCA ADDITION

Site Plan Amendment Approval (#2021-02)

Location: 634-636 Violet Avenue

Grid #: 6164-04-655006

In Attendance via Zoom: Peter Sweeny, PSA Studios

Chairman Dupree: Next on the agenda is workshop a new application. This is Duches County SPCA. They are seeking a site plan amendment to basically build a new animal medical facility, an addition to the existing building, but it's not a new use. There's already an existing animal medical facility there. It's in the old building. They're just going to relocate that, so it's in a more modern area. Also, so it's closer to the main building and probably more importantly, so that the intake I think will probably be a lot easier. We have Mr. Sweeny here from PSA studios. Peter, I'm going to turn it over to you.

Mr. Sweeny: Thank you all. Yes. My name is Peter Sweeny. I am with PSA studios. We are working with Duches County SPCA. I think the Chairman described generally what the issue is. Can I share my screen? Is it worth walking through the project?

Chairman Dupree: Oh yes, please do. Councilman Krupnick, can I think arrange that.

Ms. Polidoro: He should be able to share.

Mr. Sweeny: All right. Can everybody see? So this is the existing site plan, basically as it exists today. On the right is the existing adoption and education facility. And then, as the Chairman described, the existing medical facility, is over on the left. I assume everybody's fairly familiar with the site. The SPCA has a tremendous difficulty having these buildings separated. I think there was an initial site plan, which anticipated a phase two, off on the right-hand side of the existing adoption building. But they received some funding, they've been having tremendous financial difficulties and wanted to kind of do a much more modest proposal to be able to get the kind of medical clinic facility closer to the building. There are some real issues with topography on the other side for a small project. So the proposed plan, basically looks to take just the clinic facility, the clinic part of the existing building which is actually rather small, basically 1,700 square feet, and adding it to the existing building. Since there is no change of use, there's not going to be any additional staff or visitors as a consequence. There's no change to the amount of parking that's required for the project. Basically we've left all of the existing parking in place. Just to point that out, this is existing, 16 spots, what we've done is basically just shift the gravel access drive, which goes down to the back of the site, slightly to the left. The building that we're proposing, as I said, houses just the clinic facilities. There's some minor variation, changes in the existing building, which I don't believe we need to review. One of the big things that's an issue for the facility now is that they need to have two different entrances and accesses to two separate buildings. So this allows them to kind of unify that and create one new public access, that's easier to control, and it's certainly easier for drop-off for the public, right at that point. The proposed addition, we're basically trying to kind of, this is the existing addition right here. You can see the entrance, which is tucked back from the front facade of the building. But the proposed addition, basically, scale, material wise ties into the existing project. The intention is to propose as minimal an intervention as possible. The one other small kind of change that we're proposing is to put a new generator at the rear of the building. It's basically back, attached to where the existing dumps dumpsters are. That would be screened by the building from the front. We're proposing screening around the dumpsters, which does not have at this point. I think those are the highlights. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Board may have.

Chairman Dupree: So, Mr. Sweeny, before I turn this over to our consultants, if you go to the next slide after this, or the next page. At the far left for the new building, there's appears to be a door that exits, right there. Is that really a door that would go right out open onto the gravel driveway?

Mr. Sweeny: It is. Basically, they need to be able to still maintain some access there. They're maintaining some kennels in the existing space. And so there is some kind of traffic that does go back and forth between the two. And there's also a quarantine requirement for certain situations where the dogs come in or the, or cats come in. And so that's not used as a general entrance, but it's a convenience door.

Chairman Dupree: Go to the next slide after this, with the elevation. I'm sorry. So the wooden fence that's shown under the west elevation that's to the left or to the north, it says wood enclosure. That doesn't attach to the building, that's the enclosure for the dumpster and the generator, am I correct?

Ms. Polidoro: That's correct.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. That's all I wanted to say early. Let me start with our consultants, Ms. Franson?

Ms. Franson: Good evening. I had a comment memo that I had submitted to the Board. Mr. Sweeny, did you receive a copy of that?

Mr. Sweeny: I did.

Ms. Franson: Okay, great. In general, in terms of procedure, this is a minor addition to a building. It's within the Greenbelt. The use is an animal kennel, 10 acre minimum, and it is allowed by special use permit and site plan approval. In our discussions, with Ms. Moss, it was determined that a special use permit had been previously granted to this application. So therefore at this point, a site plan approval is required for the addition. We also discussed that given the size of the proposed addition, which is not exceeding 4,000 square feet of gross floor area, and because it is a non-residential use, it would appear to fall under the Type II category under SEQR. And I believe there is a resolution to that effect, that the Planning Board may act on this evening. In general, procedure-wise a public hearing will be required once the application is sufficiently advanced that the Planning Board feels that it can open a public hearing. In terms of referrals, I believe the Board is contemplating doing the referral to Dutchess County Planning and development this evening, but in addition to that, a request was made and in discussions with the Planning Board Engineer that it should be referred to the Dutchess County Department of Health, just because of the existing modules that are there for some kind of treatment. And you may want to expand upon that, Mr. Sweeny, but I think in general, given the fact there was an addition, to the building, that I guess there's a question whether DOH needs to review it. And then in general, for access, emergency access, it should be referred to the Roosevelt Fire Company as well. I don't know if you have any questions at this point or Pete, if you want to add anything with regard to the need to refer to DOH.

Mr. Setaro: Sure. As far as the DOH, if we're going to do a Type II action, in my opinion, we do need to do the 239 m for County Planning, but the Health Department is going to have to issue an approval anyway on the project because they are proposing a new septic tank to connect to their existing leach field. It's fairly minor, but it does require approval of the Health Department. So the Health Department is going to get this anyway. So, I don't know that we need to make a special referral to them, but they will require an approval.

Chairman Dupree: I think a courtesy referral is in order though.

Mr. Setaro: That's fine. Sure. You can do that. Absolutely.

Chairman Dupree: Go ahead and get the process started. Bonnie, before I leave you. In your memo, parking calculation necessary, just in the small stuff, that we need to show the kennels. There's a kennel run, that's not shown here Mr. Sweeny.

Mr. Sweeny: I'm not sure that it's still there. Are you talking about in this area here? [*There was collective affirmation.*] Okay. All right. If it's there, I'll show it.

Ms. Polidoro: Is it intended that they will be demolished?

Mr. Sweeny: That's outside of what my conversation has been with them, but I'll clarify that and I can add that to the site plan.

Ms. Franson: To clarify, Peter, there's a proposed line that's going from the septic tank around the propane tanks to connect into a system at the other building, is that what's happening?

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah, there's an existing septic system for the existing medical facility. This was, in coordination with the construction manager, the builder on the project, and this was their preferred solution. There's no additional use being proposed and there's an existing system for the same use as presently exists.

Ms. Franson: So I think that from our perspective, why it's important to show the kennel buildings because you have the line there, but it's kind of unclear, you know, where it is in relation to those other structures. So it would be good to show those. Should I go on Michael or did you want to just kind of highlight.

Chairman Dupree: I wanted you to hit on #25 and #26 in particular, because 26 I feel terribly guilty about, but when we first met with Mr. Sweeny, the law hadn't been adopted, and I just forgot that this was going to affect the rest of the districts around town.

Ms. Franson: Okay. So with regard to 25, that was just a general comment that if there's any kind of rooftop mechanicals, there would be a need to screen that. The big change, as per Local Law 1 of 2020, is that the zoning chapter was amended to state that there will be no flat roofs and at this point one of the elevations for the new addition shows a flat roof. And so the question is, can it be angled in some way, so as to avoid the need to consider whether variances are needed? There's also, I think, a general interpretation as to whether it can be waived, by the Board, because it's within, I believe, the development standards, where there's some considerations to be able to waive. But I think that the easy solution would be if you could pop up the roof so that it's angled and it's not flat. That's the first question.

Mr. Sweeny: Can I ask is there a definition of what angled means.

Ms. Franson: No.

Chairman Dupree: What the pitch would be? So the problem with this is that it used to be that, where a flat roof was mandated more or less by the size and scale of the building, that it could be permitted as long as it was a hidden or screened with parapets, cornices, et cetera., so it didn't look that flat. When we first saw this again, and I'm sorry, I feel terrible that I didn't, I just wasn't thinking, but when Tad and I first met with you, I just wasn't thinking that this would affect the other districts. The thing is, that while we can normally waive some site plan standards or relax them, I should say, in this case, it now says that these are not permitted anywhere. So I'll let Victoria weigh in, but I think that sort of trumps our ability to relax the standard.

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah. I mean, I can weigh in architecturally, obviously we could pitch the roof, but I do know that from the beginning, when we jumped on board with trying to help out the SPCA, you know, there was a really strong desire, informally to just make sure that, that the addition relate to and feel cohesive with the existing building, which is a flat roof building. And so, I'm happy to sort of take a look at and consider a pitched roof, but just understanding that what we put together was I think very much...Compared to what some of their original proposals were, is really trying, I think, given the budget to tie itself in successfully to the existing buildings.

Chairman Dupree: I completely agree. I actually saw the original proposal, and I think that was my reaction, that maybe caused this to change, because I didn't think it would be approved by the Board. And this is very harmonious and elegant, like the original structure is. I just want to make sure we can figure this one out, because this is small, but again, it's the way the Code is written, saying that it's now no longer allowed in any district or they're no longer allowed in any district. So, anyway, Ms. Franson back to you. Bonnie, anything else you want to highlight?

Ms. Franson: Yes. So you mentioned the outdoor kennels, just to clarify, the real property suggests that you're on a well system. There is, it says abandoned well on the existing condition sheet. Has that already been abandoned and are you on centralized water?

Mr. Sweeny: We're on centralized water. That's abandoned. It's just a note from the original site plan.

Ms. Franson: Okay. Michael touched upon the door to the new medical facility. There is some concern that essentially the door is opening up onto a driveway, because you've had to shift the driveway a bit and they're taking up some parking spaces to accommodate the driveway. And the question is and the concern is how does one protect someone exiting the building? Can bollards be placed there? Can there be something done there to ensure that when someone's exiting, they're not exiting when a vehicle is passing? Striping something. There's a desire to address that.

Mr. Sweeny: Okay.

Ms. Franson: In general limits of disturbance should be shown. And you do have sort of a construction plan area, but we're looking more for the limits of disturbance around the plantings and then incorporating that area where there may be some digging done to accommodate the septic line and just to make sure that, I believe you're under one acre with regard to the need for any kind of SWPPP.

Mr. Sweeny: Right.

Ms. Franson: I think most of the other comments are pretty self-explanatory. I mean, those are really highlights. We did mention, in general, it's our understanding that there may have been a master plan for the entire site, and there may have been buildings or uses contemplated to the East, which would it be accessed by that drive. And so, in general, we just want to make sure that whatever improvements are being done, that if that master plan is still in play, that any of the improvements don't, you know, the way the driveway is being designed, et cetera, don't affect your ability to carry out that master plan.

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah. I mean, I can't speak for SPCA, but I think after what we went through with them, looking at their options, there's no intention to kind of pursue another phase of work there. But is that something that we should try and, and make clear in this?

Chairman Dupree: It would be helpful for Tad, if as part of this, you just said, we're not going to be following through on that master plan. And then it will be amending the site plan as needed. The reason why, is this was addressed sort of by SEQR, the master plan, because they'd already told us what they planned to do, which included equine facilities, et cetera. And as you said, phase two was supposed to be kind of behind where the offices are right now, or to the east of that and I know there are topographical issues there. It's not a big deal. It's just that we should probably know or not know, that's all.

Mr. Sweeny: I will see if I...There's also access issues, you know? So, all right. I'll clarify that and I'll have to let you know.

Ms. Franson: And just lastly, I would say that you do show some potential plantings. So if you could be a little more detailed as to the species, quantity, planting size and then if you are proposing any kind of lighting on the facade, on the building, then to just provide some kind of spec or if it's the same as what already exists to maybe add some notations.

Mr. Sweeny: Okay. Yeah. I think we call that out somewhere. I'll try and make sure it's clear, but they're not intending any. There's existing lighting under the canopy, which lights the walkway up to the entrance. So there was not, on the front, there was no new lighting, but by Code that side door will need a light. So, alright, we'll include that.

Ms. Franson: Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Setaro?

Mr. Setaro: Sure. Hi Peter, how are you? It's been awhile. Peter and I do quite a bit of work together at Bard college. So, he's a good man.

Mr. Sweeny: Likewise.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah, so we don't have a lot of comments. There's not a lot of engineering things here. I assume there's going to be some roof leaders. So if you can just make sure that those are tied into the drainage system. And then just a detail of the driveway, for the gravel driveway. And then I mentioned earlier about the septic tank will require the approval of the County Health Department. But Peter, you had said that because the medical facility is being moved, that they thought to tie into the existing septic system for that building, because that way it wouldn't be any increase in use. Is there a separate septic system for the newer building?

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah.

Mr. Setaro: Okay, and there's no good way to get to it?

Mr. Sweeny: Well, this was a call from, actually Doug Stravinsky's helping them with the construction. It's like old home week.

Mr. Setaro: I know right.

Mr. Sweeny: But I think the thought was that would actually be easier. That was his thought.

Ms. Polidoro: Peter, can you explain, what's going to happen with the old building then, because if you're transferring the parking to this new building and you're transferring the septic to this new building, is it going to create a large structure that's not able to be used?

Mr. Sweeny: They do not have plans. We talked to Michael and Tad early on, any proposed future use they'll have to bring to the Board. But for now, the only thing that is going to be there is sort of overflow kennels, if they run out of kennel space in the existing facility. So all of the, all the offices, all of the kind of occupied space is being moved to the medical facility.

Ms. Polidoro: I would think and I'll let Tad correct me if I'm wrong, but I would think the Town is going to want some kind of notation indicating that this building is not to be used absent, you know, site plan review for any new use, because again, you know, they're not evaluating parking and septic and any of the other impacts.

Chairman Dupree: If I can toss in there, Victoria, the kennels, I think I've said this before, they're already kennels inside that old building. So it wouldn't be a new use if they had to be used for overflow.

Ms. Polidoro: Right? Well, the dogs aren't flushing the toilets.

Ms. Moss: The wash out water from the kennels is going into a system.

Ms. Polidoro: Right. So I just want to make sure that we're not going to have...I just want to understand when we get to the end of this, how that building can, and can't be used.

Ms. Moss: Right there was a cat room and offices in that building. And you said that all of the offices are moving to the new building.

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah. The offices, the clinics, basically, all of that part. This is what's there. It's spread all over the place there, but there's no office space. There's no use in that building, that is proposed as of this time. So I don't think they'll have any issue if need to put some qualification in there, that the building is not being occupied. And I think, as I said, when we met the first time, they completely understand that any proposed use...I mean, basically, any reasonable assessment of that building is going to indicate that it's got to get torn down, but there they're not quite at that point yet. So, I'll leave the Board to sort of decide how they want to put that, put the language in there for that.

Ms. Polidoro: I have one more question and this is not legal, but the new entrance is that just for staff or are you going to be closing the main entrance?

Mr. Sweeny: No. There they're two separate facilities. They need two separate entrances. The existing main entrance is for the adoption center. Right now, staff comes in the entrance. That's basically where this is. But, if you're bringing a pet that needs medical

attention, you're going to go to the clinic entrance. If you go to adopt a pet, you're going to go to the adoption entrance.

Ms. Polidoro: Okay. So there'll be two. Okay, understood. Thank you.

Mr. Setaro: I just have to say a couple things before we go on to the Board Members. So, Peter, as far as the other door that exits out onto the gravel drive, and I'm not very good as far as my left-hand swing and my right-hand swing, but do you have the door that swings towards the back of the site?

Mr. Sweeny: Well, one thing that I'm just looking at right now, is it can probably be an in-swing door. It's not an egress door, so it doesn't have to open in the direction of travel. It's a convenience door, so that might slightly address it, but I agree we could stripe that area or possibly provide some...Yeah, we'll look at.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah, you'll look at it. And the other thing is, does the applicant have an engineer that you're going to work with for the Health Department approval?

Mr. Sweeny: Doug has been interfacing on that.

Mr. Setaro: I mean, I'd be glad to, I mean, I know this project is on a budget and we all love the SPCA facility. I'd be glad to offer to talk to you and Doug. I would hate to see it get into a lot of issues with the County Health Department, so maybe there's some thoughts that I could offer, as long as the Board doesn't have an issue with me talking to you and your construction manager on some initial thoughts, I might have to try to help out a little bit.

Chairman Dupree: I don't believe the Board will have an objection to that.

Mr. Sweeny: That'd be great Pete.

Mr. Setaro: All right. So, when you're ready, why don't you contact me and we can get on the phone with Doug or we'll figure out something. All right.

Mr. Sweeny: Yeah. I appreciate that a lot.

Mr. Setaro: Yeah, no problem.

Chairman Dupree: Ms. Moss, comments?

Ms. Moss: I just want to make sure about the mechanicals for this building. Are you modifying the existing mechanicals to handle the additional square footage?

Mr. Sweeny: There'll be mechanicals. Right now, they're all wall mounted on the back of the building. I will check and review with Doug and I hear that if there's anything on the roof, we'll notate those and provide screening. It may turn out that if we have to pitch, if we have to do something with a roof, we'll incorporate that.

Chairman Dupree: Anything else Tad?

Ms. Moss: I'm trying to remember whether or not that well was officially abandoned and sealed, according to, I think it's Department of Health standards, or is it DEC standards?

Mr. Setaro: Health Department Standards.

Ms. Moss: Health Department standards at the end of construction of the new building. I'm trying to remember, or did they keep it as non-potable maybe?

Mr. Sweeny: I can't answer. I know that, this was noted on the original site plan, so it's sort of carried over.

Ms. Moss: It's in the middle of the parking area, so maybe it was officially sealed.

Mr. Setaro: We can check that out. They're going to be dealing with the County Health Department anyway, so they should have a record of the well abandonment, because you have to have to have an engineer send in a certification letter that it was done.

Chairman Dupree: Victoria before we leave the consultants. Can you weigh in and what your thoughts are about the flat roof, the prohibition on flat roofs?

Ms. Polidoro: So this is a tough one and I'm not sure I want to weigh in right at this moment. I think I want to talk to Tad, because it's going to set the precedent for review of future applications.

Chairman Dupree: You guys confer. And if you want me there too, I'd be happy to. Or any other Planning Board Members because yes, this is going to set a precedent for all other applications. Okay. Let's start with...Yes.

Ms. Franson: Michael, I would just like to also check notes because when the zoning was being putting put in place, I know the Planning Board had comments, so let me just also look at my notes to determine what the intent was. As far as if there was an expectation that it could be waived or not.

Chairman Dupree: Good idea. And just for everyone's reference, Ms. Franson did write the zonings, so she has copious notes on it and can go back and check. Thank you. Let's go with the Board Members, Ms. Wasser?

Ms. Wasser: First. Okay. Well, I hope there can be some resolution to the flat roof issue that doesn't set a negative precedent that helps you SPCA. Because I know this is really being done on a tight budget and I like the design. I like the elevations. I think that Peter did a great job, you know, fitting in this piece. So I hope there can be a resolution to that. Okay, so that's my general comment that I do think that the gravel drive has some funky angles in it and I'll leave that to the Fire Department. There's like three or four different angles in that new little stretch of gravel drive. So I don't know aesthetically how that will look. It'll probably be okay. But I think the Fire Department, I'm curious to see if they're going to be fine with those angles, on making the turn. And, I saw a little typo on your environmental assessment form where it said 168 square foot addition. And I know that it was supposed to be four digits, 1684. So just have that aligned. I think those are my comments. I really like it and I support it and I hope we can make this as painless as

possible. And I also want to just take this time to thank Bonnie. I really, really liked the layout and the approach to your comments. I found the summary table helpful, and I loved that it was page by page, which is how I look at drawings. So I really like looking at your comments page by page. And I just want to thank you for that.

Ms. Franson: Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: I agree by the way. I'd already told, Ms. Franson that, when I first got a chance to review it. Ms. DiNapoli, do you want to join in next?

Ms. DiNapoli: I'll start by also thanking Bonnie for her layout of her comments. You know, when you do something new and different, you never know if it's going to be successful, but thanks. My question is about the flat roof and I don't know if this is feasible, how we tried to resolve it with the Sake' Brewery. Would that be a way of resolving it or not?

Ms. Polidoro: The Code has changed since the Sake' Brewery.

Ms. DiNapoli: But it's still slightly.

Ms. Polidoro: Oh, you mean just like the very small pitch?

Ms. Moss: Let's let Victoria and I work it out and talk about it offline.

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay.

Ms. Weiser: A very small pitch. There you go. But that might be enough.

Chairman Dupree: And remember also that the Sake' Brewery has the ungawa in the front, which also disguises the flatness of the roof, but let's let legal and zoning discuss this first and see what we can do.

Ms. DiNapoli: Okay, otherwise I look forward to the project moving. The one dog I had was through the SPCA.

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. Mr. Pickett?

Mr. Pickett: A couple of comments, one, I'll second or third, the way Bonnie writes up the memorandums and notes, it's very matter of fact, laid out very well. Thank you. I like the design of the building. My concerns were again, that access door that's on the north side that you're stepping out on gravel with no protection. So my thought was that if you put a concrete pad there and a couple of bollards to protect it, just to make sure that you don't have any issues with it. And then the other thing was the guarantee that if on that rooftop, there are mechanicals, if there needs to be mechanicals that visually they're obstructed from, the parking lot, the street or whatever. We had one that we let go a couple of years ago, and every time I drive up 9G I really regret it. So just make sure that that's covered, if there needs to be mechanicals on top. Also, along with the concrete and the bollards outside of that access door to make sure there's proper lighting over it too. Just to make sure people see it at night.

Chairman Dupree: Okay. Thank you, Brent. And I know the parcel you're talking about, just as a reminder to the Board, our Code does require that elevations show, any air handlers, anything that's going to be on the rooftop for mechanicals, but we don't always get those. We get the pretty picture with, you know, people looking like they're strolling nicely and happy. This beautiful building with landscape that's already fully grown from 40 years. So that's why Mr. Sweeny that we're all emphasizing this because we all go by that one site and go, Uh Oh, we missed it. And Ms. Dexter?

Vice-Chair Dexter: Thank you. I will opine that I also like the review memorandum. It's organized very nicely and it helped me to re orient myself. Peter, I was on the Board of the SPCA and saw that original building go from the master plan all the way through final completion and opening. And, so I have a lot of history on that site. It occurred to me that it's been about 20 years since we did that original master plan and we were looking 20, 30 years in the future. And here we are pretty much and wow, a lot of things have changed. So many things have changed. I can see that, you know, sometimes that original vision, first of all, you don't need it now. We had never anticipated that by building that new adoption center that we wouldn't need all the additional kennel space, because once you have a nice building where people like to come in and they're not afraid, because it's a welcoming building, and the animals are housed healthfully and they look safe and comfortable. The adoption numbers just like went through the roof. And so things change. My comment on the actual site plan. Let's see if I can bring it up. So I'm looking at sheet four, which basically shows all the new stuff that's happening. With regards to that door that opens up to the north, there was a very similar door to that on the far south of the building, they ended up having to build a little fence enclosure around it because of escaping dogs. So if that's the kennel exit, you may end up having the same type of - you never want to go directly from inside to outside with an animal that you don't know really well and you don't know if they're going to escape on you. So if you look at the Southern end of the building, you'll see how they built that little escape thing. And I'm thinking that if you needed to do that, you might end up having to lose a couple of those parking spots. You couldn't have that road right up against the building.

Mr. Sweeny: Sorry, the one thing operationally that a little different. It says kennel in that space, but I think it's really just a, kind of a receiving space. It's not like there's dog walkers who are going to be walking. The other end is dog walkers, I think, where they go in and out. So, anyway, I'm happy to review that with their operations and see if that's a concern.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Yeah. That's one of the first things that I saw because it, and again, there could be people trying to pull in and out of there. Wouldn't we want to see any of those big boulders that are currently in the parking lot, that they use to delineate the parking area on the site plan. Because they're using those as, again, to delineate the parking. The other thing I saw was there's not a lot of landscaping on that site and if you're already enclosing the dumpster and you've got a nice fence, I'm not sure why you need the shrubs. Because it looks like it's would actually be shielding it from the back of the property and nobody's looking at it from the back or the side. So I'm not sure you need that landscaping.

Chairman Dupree: Good Point.

Vice-Chair Dexter: And then the only other thing is isn't there another exit? Let's see, what page was that, it looked like there was another exit on the backside of the building.

Mr. Sweeny: Yes.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Right. And that goes under that existing overhang also.

Mr. Sweeny: Yes.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Okay. And is that an employee entrance?

Mr. Sweeny: Yes. It's basically for maintenance and service. There's access to get back to the dumpsters.

Vice-Chair Dexter: Okay. You've got a lot of doors for a small space, but that's okay. I'm sure you need it. And then my thought on the roof was that, just as the original building is flat, but with the mechanicals on the roof, they put up that striped...

Mr. Sweeny: The lattice, the vertical lattice.

Vice-Chair Dexter: The vertical latticing that maybe just some creative, I don't know, making that look like it's angled. Would, you know, again, we'll let legal and zoning work that out, but, if you have to hide something anyway, maybe you can use that as your get out of flat roof jail card. *Laughter.* But otherwise I admire how, it reminds me of like a module that just has been added onto the back and how it carries on the tone of the building. And as you're looking at it's not going to pop out at you and go, Oh, that shouldn't be there. So I commend you, that's a very sleek design.

Mr. Sweeny: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Dexter: And I'm sure we can work out all these issues.

Chairman Dupree: And the other Ann, Ms. Weiser?

Ms. Weiser: Well, everyone's said pretty much everything. I, too, agree with the architecture. It's a really handsome addition to the building. It seamlessly, as Anne said, carries through the whole design. And I hope as well that a dignified solution can be made for the roof because it is really attractive.

Mr. Sweeny: Thank you.

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Sweeney will be happy to know that I don't really have any additional comments. Everything was covered by my colleagues with one exception, at least tonight, I think it's in the memo, but you have listed 5.5% coverage for the site. And since you did not show the kennel run buildings, which we did a Google earth, but that could have been shot a while back, but it showed it then. So if it's not shown on the plan, we want to make sure that you have the actual coverage calculated correctly for the lot. But everything else has been shown. I also want to echo my colleagues, when I think about architecture, I often think about Prince Charles who once referred to an addition to a

building in London as a monstrous carbuncle on the body of the building, which I thought it was sort of, nobody uses carbuncle anymore. But if you know what that is, it's pretty monstrous anyway. This is not that case. This is actually a very sleek addition. It fits in handsomely; it snugs in perfectly. And again, I want to reiterate my apologies. We weren't thinking about how that law, when it's passed might impact something like this, where we have a very modern and contemporary structure. So I'm confident that we'll work it out somehow, some way. We've heard some thoughts tonight about maybe the wooden enclosure, other things. So just give us a chance to discuss, and then we can take it from there. But otherwise again, I have nothing else to add. We do have a resolution prepared tonight, and I believe that going to be introduced by Ms. Wasser, who is already ready to go.

**RESOLUTION CLASSIFYING THE ACTION AND REFERRING THE APPLICATION TO THE
DUTCHESS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

Dutchess County SPCA Addition

Date: February 3, 2021

Moved By: Ms. Wasser

Resolution: # 2021-02

Seconded By: Ms. Weiser

WHEREAS, the applicant, Dutchess County SPCA Inc., has submitted an application for site plan approval to construct an approximately 1,684 sq. ft. building addition to relocate a veterinary clinic with kennels at an existing adoption and education facility, along with the construction of additional parking and walkways (the "Project"), on property located at 636 Violet Avenue, tax parcel no. 6164-04-655006, in the Greenbelt District (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Project is depicted on a proposed site plan entitled "SPCA Addition," Sheets G000, C000, C100, C101, A100, A101, and A200, prepared by PSA Studios, dated December 14, 2020 (the "Site Plan Set"); and

WHEREAS, a kennel is a permitted use in the Greenbelt District subject to site plan and special use permit approval; and

WHEREAS, on July 24, 2002, the Town of Hyde Park Zoning Board of Appeals granted the Dutchess County SPCA Inc. a special use permit for a kennel; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has submitted a Short Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") dated October 23, 2020, pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with SEQRA, the Planning Board is required to determine the classification of the proposed Project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(9), the expansion of a nonresidential structure or facility involving less than 4,000 square feet of gross floor area is a Type II action pursuant to SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Project is located within 500 feet of New York State Route 9G, also known as Violet Avenue; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, projects located within 500 feet of a state highway must be referred to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development for a report and recommendation thereon.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Board hereby:

- 1. Classifies the Project as a Type II action under SEQRA; and**
- 2. Directs its secretary to refer the Site Plan Set to the Dutchess County Department of Planning and Development pursuant to Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law; and**
- 3. Directs its secretary to refer the Site Plan Set to the Roosevelt Fire District and to the Dutchess County Department of Behavioral and Community Health.**

Aye	Chairman Dupree
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Absent	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thank you any further discussion? All in favor, please raise your hand and signify by saying aye. Aye. Motion carries unanimously, no nays or abstentions. And may I get a motion to set the public hearing for this. We'll go ahead and start this for March 17th. I think that will give us time to hear back from the other agencies. Is that okay with you, Mr. Sweeny?

Mr. Sweeny: Yes. And I guess on the flat roof issue. I mean, as far as I'm concerned, that's sort of the biggest thing. Will somebody be in touch before then, or is that...?

Chairman Dupree: I thought maybe you've seen how I kind of overuse emails on this stuff. So once we have a discussion, I promise you it'll be shot right out to you.

Mr. Sweeny: Okay, great. Great.

Mr. Setaro: Abuse.

Chairman Dupree: Abuse the emails. *Laughter.* Ms. Dexter did you make that motion for March 17th?

Vice-Chair Dexter: No, but I shall. I make that motion.

MOTION: Vice-Chair Dexter

SECOND: Chairman Dupree

To set a public hearing for Dutchess County SPCA for March 17, 2021.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: Thank you. I will second. All in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Motion carries unanimously. No nays or abstentions. Thank you.

Mr. Sweeny: Thank you all very much.

Chairman Dupree: And Peter Setaro thank you for your generous offer to meet with Peter Sweeny. I was just trying to say PS, PS and they even have the same initials.

Mr. Sweeny: I know. We should start a new company, right? *Laughter.*

Mr. Setaro: No.

Mr. Sweeny: No? I've got one. You're welcome to join.

Chairman Dupree: Mr. Sweeny, thank you for joining us. And again, I believe you heard positive reviews tonight.

Mr. Sweeny: Which I very much appreciate. And I'll pass that on to everybody at the SPCA.

Chairman Dupree: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Sweeny: Thank you.

Ms. Wasser: Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Dupree: There being no other business, I think. I will make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Vice-Chair Dexter: I will second that.

MOTION: Chairman Dupree
SECOND: Vice-Chair Dexter

To adjourn.

Aye	Ms. Weiser
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Absent	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Chairman Dupree

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried

Chairman Dupree: All in favor, please raise your hand and say aye. Aye. Thank you everybody. Thank you to Councilman Krupnick for being our director, so to speak for the Town tonight. A pleasure to see everybody. See you again in two weeks.

**** Motion made at the April 21, 2021 Hyde Park Planning Board Meeting****

MOTION: Mr. Pickett
SECOND: Ms. Weiser

To approve the minutes of the February 3, 2021 Planning Board Meeting.

Aye	Chairman Dupree
Aye	Vice-Chair Dexter
Aye	Ms. DiNapoli
Abstain	Mr. Oliver
Aye	Mr. Pickett
Aye	Ms. Wasser
Aye	Ms. Weiser

VOICE VOTE Aye-6 Absent-0 Abstain-1 Nay-0 Motion Carried